Psychological Monographs

General and Applied

No. 381
1954

Behavior on the Rorschach Test and a Measure of Self-Acceptance

By

Fred E. La Fon

University of Hawaii

Price, $1.00

Vol. 68
No. 10

Edited by Herbert S. Conrad

Published by The American Psychological Association, Inc.

Fred E. La Fon

Psychological Monographs: General and Applied

Combining the *Applied Psychology Monographs* and the *Archives of Psychology* with the *Psychological Monographs*

Editor

HERBERT S. CONRAD

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education
Washington 25, D.C.

Managing Editor

LORRAINE BOUTHILET

Consulting Editors

DONALD E. BAIER
FRANK A. BEACH
ROBERT G. BERNREUTER
WILLIAM A. BROWNELL
HAROLD E. BURTT
JERRY W. CARTER, JR.
CLYDE H. COOMBS
JOHN G. DARLEY
JOHN F. DASHIELL
EUGENIA HANFMANN
EDNA HEIDBREDER
HAROLD E. JONES
DONALD W. MACKINNON
LORRIN A. RIGGS
CARL R. ROGERS
SAUL ROSENZWEIG
ROSS STAGNER
PERCIVAL M. SYMONDS
JOSEPH TIFFIN
LEDYARD R TUCKER
JOSEPH ZUBIN

MANUSCRIPTS should be sent to the Editor.

Because of lack of space, the *Psychological Monographs* can print only the original or advanced contribution of the author. *Background and bibliographic materials must, in general, be totally excluded* or kept to an irreducible minimum. Statistical tables should be used to present only the most important of the statistical data or evidence.

The first page of the manuscript should contain the title of the paper, the author's name, and his institutional connection (or his city of residence). Acknowledgments should be kept brief, and appear as a *footnote* on the first page. No table of contents need be included. For other directions or suggestions on the preparation of manuscripts, see: CONRAD, H. S. Preparation of manuscripts for publication as monographs. *J. Psychol.*, 1948, 26, 447-459.

CORRESPONDENCE CONCERNING BUSINESS MATTERS (such as author's fees, subscriptions and sales, change of address, etc.) should be addressed to the American Psychological Association, Inc., 1333 Sixteenth St. N.W., Washington 6, D.C. Address changes must arrive by the 25th of the month to take effect the following month. Undelivered copies resulting from address changes will not be replaced; subscribers should notify the post office that they will guarantee third-class forwarding postage.

COPYRIGHT, 1954, BY THE AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION, INC.

Vol. 68, No. 10 Whole No. 381, 1954

Psychological Monographs: General and Applied

Behavior on the Rorschach Test and a Measure of Self-Acceptance[1]

Fred E. La Fon

Psychological Clinic, University of Hawaii

I. The Problem

In recent years there has been a renewed interest in the "self" as an important factor in personality development and in the interpretation of behavior. Allport (3) gives a historical summary of this development and a number of publications (13, 23, 26, 30, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 42, 44) have dealt with the concept of the self and various aspects of the picture of the self, as perceived or experienced by the individual. Aspects of the individual's perception of himself have been related to adjustment (8, 9, 11, 12, 23, 26, 30, 34, 38, 41, 42), and the relationship between attitudes toward the self and attitudes toward the environment and other people has been discussed and investigated experimentally (7, 18, 24, 28, 31, 41, 43, 44).

The Rorschach test is widely accepted as a means of evaluating personality structure and dynamics, basic attitudes toward people and the environment, and degree of psychological adjustment. If an individual's perception of himself and his attitudes toward this perception are identifiable and measurable aspects of his personality, there ought to be a relationship between Rorschach performance and a measure of attitudes toward the self. Furthermore it should, in general, be possible to predict, on the one hand, from Rorschach theory and experimental studies, and, on the other hand, from personality theory and experimental evidence dealing with attitudes toward the self, the specific ways in which this relationship will manifest itself.

The focal concept in this study is that of "self-acceptance." Self-acceptance, for the purposes of this study, is, first of all, an attitude that an individual has developed toward the picture or concept he has formed of himself through self-observation. It occurs on a continuum; that is, people may have varying degrees of self-acceptance or a relative lack of self-acceptance, or, phrased differently, have varying degrees of self-rejection. Self-acceptance is essentially the same thing as self-esteem, how much the self is liked and respected, how adequate the self is felt to be. And finally, ambivalence or uncertainty about the self picture is closely related to a lack of self-acceptance, since the person who accepts himself, who has a high level of self-esteem, who considers himself to be an adequate person cannot at the same time be ambivalent or uncertain about the way he perceives himself.

The approach used in this study involved the selection of groups of sub-

[1] This monograph is based on a thesis submitted to the University of Rochester in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

The writer wishes to express his indebtedness to Dr. Emory L. Cowen for his invaluable criticisms and suggestions during the planning and execution of this study.

jects who fell at the extremes of the continuum of self-acceptance, and then predicting on the one hand from the theoretical thinking and experimental work done on self-acceptance and on the other hand from Rorschach theory and experimentation, just how the Rorschach behavior of these groups ought to differ. To implement this procedure, 11 "correlates" of self-acceptance were derived from statements in the literature about this concept, and predictions were made as to how these correlates would show up in Rorschach performance. The following section outlines these correlates and the associated predictions.

II. Correlates and Predictions

Correlate A. Anxiety

The self-accepting person is relatively free from anxiety, while the individual at the extreme pole of self-rejection experiences a great deal of anxiety (9, 37, 38, 41).

Prediction 1. The nonself-accepting group will have a higher anxiety score by Elizur's (16, 19) method of content scoring.

Prediction 2. The self-accepting group will have a higher positive sum for the sign $[FCh - (ChF + Ch)]$ wt. (29, 32, 35).

Prediction 3. The nonself-accepting group will have a higher $(k + K)$, kF and KF to be included in this sum (25).

Prediction 4. The nonself-accepting group will give a greater amount of c, cF to be included in the tabulation (10).

Prediction 5. The nonself-accepting group will give a greater amount of m, this to include mF and Fm (10, 25).

Prediction 6. The nonself-accepting group will have a larger number of percepts involving exaggerated or minimized size or power (40).

Prediction 7. The self-accepting group will have a higher sum $(H - Hd)$ (29).

Prediction 8. The nonself-accepting group will give more *Do* or *Hdx* and *Adx* responses (4, 29, 35).

It must be recognized that any one individual may not manifest his anxiety in more than one or two of these ways at any one time. Consequently, the possibility exists that some of these "signs" of anxiety may not occur with enough frequency in the groups to be studied here to yield statistical significance.

Correlate B. Hostility

The person who rejects his self picture is likely to be hostile towards himself and to entertain hostile appraisals of other people and his environment (7, 9, 17, 44).

Prediction 9. The nonself-accepting group will have a higher hostility score as determined by Elizur's Rorschach Content Test (16, 19).

Correlate C. Internalized Values

The self-accepting person tends to perceive his standards as being based upon his own experiences and is not likely to see himself as dominated by a situation (9, 38, 41).

Prediction 10. The self-accepting group will have a higher number of M responses. Since $M-$ is usually considered to have pathological weight and might tend to distort the picture in favor of the nonself-accepting group, such responses will not be counted in this computation (25, 27, 29, 32).

Prediction 11. The self-accepting group will show a more favorable pattern relationship between W, M perceived in whole or large detail areas, and M perceived in small or rarely selected details (32).

Correlate D. Conformance to or Reliance on External Standards

The person who does not accept himself tends to perceive his standards as being based on the attitudes or desires of others (9, 38, 41).

Prediction 12. The nonself-accepting group will show a higher $F\%$ (4, 25, 35).

Correlate E. Reality Perception

The individual who does not accept himself, who feels inadequate to deal with his perceptions of reality, feels threatened by such perceptions and is likely to reject or distort them (38, 42).

Prediction 13. The self-accepting group will tend to have closer to the optimal range of popular responses (seven to nine). A *P* score above the optimal range may reflect the tendency to conform to outside standards which has already been predicted in the nonself-accepting group (Correlate D). Therefore, a discrepancy score which takes into account deviations on both sides of the optimal range would seem to be the most appropriate measure. The self-accepting group, then, will have a lower discrepancy score (4, 25, 27, 29, 35).

Prediction 14. The self-accepting group will have a higher $\%R$ + (29).

Prediction 15. The nonself-accepting group will have a higher $\%Dr$ (25, 35).

Correlate F. Emotional Stability and Maturity and Capacity for Social Relationships

The self-accepting person is one who rationally modifies his behavior in order to avoid trampling on the feelings or rights of others, who does not doubt that he is able to contribute to the welfare and satisfaction of others, who does not become upset when others criticize his behavior but evaluates this criticism objectively, who is not shy and inhibited in social relationships, who assumes responsibility for making his own decisions and accepts the consequences of his behavior, and who resists domination (9, 41).

Prediction 16. The self-accepting group will have a higher sum in the positive direction of $FC - (CF + C)$. Since $FC -$, $F \leftrightarrow C$, and F/C are considered to represent a less effective adjustment, these scores will not be tabulated for this prediction (10, 25, 27).

Prediction 17. The self-accepting group will have a higher sum in the positive direction of $[FC - (CF + C)]$ wt., with $FC -$, $F \leftrightarrow C$, and F/C not tabulated (29).

Prediction 18. The self-accepting group will have a higher sum in the positive direction of $M + FC - (CF + C)$, with $M -$, $FC -$, $F \leftrightarrow C$, and F/C not tabulated (29).

Prediction 19. The self-accepting group will have more *FC* responses, with $FC -$, $F \leftrightarrow C$, and F/C not tabulated (10, 25, 27, 35).

Prediction 20. Sum C will be higher in the self-accepting group (35).

Prediction 21. The self-accepting group will have more *Fc* responses (10, 25, 29).

Prediction 22. The sum $(Fc + c + C') - (FC + CF + C)$ will be higher in the positive direction for the nonself-accepting group (25).

Prediction 23. The self-accepting group will have a more favorable pattern relationship between *M*, *Sum C*, and $F\%$ (25).

Correlate G. Integrative Capacity

People with unstable self concepts are unable to consolidate their various self concepts into a stable organization, and the integrative personality is the one that can handle the complexity of relationships with other persons (9, 23).

Prediction 24. The self-accepting group

will produce more of the $W+$ type of response as described by Rapaport (32, 35).

Correlate H. Defense Mechanisms—Denial, Repression, and Suppression

The self-accepting person is not likely to attempt to deny or distort the existence of any feelings, limitations, abilities, or good qualities that he sees in himself (23, 41, 42).

Prediction 25. The self-accepting group will give more human content responses (22).

Prediction 26. The nonself-accepting group will have more rejection of cards, more denial of percepts in inquiry, and more responses that seem to indicate a denial of perception or fantasy.

Correlate I. Indecisiveness

Nonself-accepting people see themselves in a variable way from trait to trait, suggesting that they have an ambivalent attitude toward themselves (9).

Prediction 27. The nonself-accepting group will produce more blocked movement responses as described by Piotrowski (32) and more *M*'s and *FM*'s where the person or animal does not know what to do, in what direction to go, what is going to happen, etc.

Prediction 28. The nonself-accepting group will produce more responses in which there is hesitancy or confusion over whether the content is animal or human and over the sex of human percepts, more precision alternatives, and give more qualifying verbalizations which appear to indicate indecisiveness or ambivalence toward their perceptions or fantasies.

Correlate J. Defensiveness

A person who is lacking in self-esteem defends himself against the feelings of insecurity which arise from this condition, while a self-accepting individual does not exhibit a need to make excuses for his behavior (9, 36, 41).

Prediction 29. The nonself-accepting group will manifest more defensiveness toward the test and the examiner in six types of verbalizations: (*a*) criticism verbalizations, (*b*) verbal aggression, (*c*) self-depreciation verbalizations, (*d*) verbal attitudes of caution, suspicion or uncertainty, (*e*) qualifying remarks, and (*f*) requests or demands for evaluation of results.

Correlate K. Critical Attitude

People who are critical of themselves are likely to be critical of others, particularly when this critical attitude is a "tendency to disparage" arising out of the feeling of inferiority (1, 31).

Prediction 30. The sum $(H + A) - (Hd + Ad)$ will be larger in the self-accepting group (25).

III. Procedures

Instruments

The Self-Rating Inventory developed by Brownfain (9) was used to provide a measure of self-acceptance. From the several indices of attitudes toward the self-picture, which can be derived from this inventory, the stability of self-concept index was chosen as the primary criterion of self-acceptance. However, Cowen (15) using a modified version of the Self-Rating Inventory has found that the negative rating seems to be the most sensitive measure of all those derived from the Self-Rating Inventory in terms of demonstrable correlates on other personality and sociopsychological indices, and this

measure was used as a secondary criterion of self-acceptance.

The F Scale developed by Frenkel-Brunswik and her associates (2) was investigated in an attempt to find an instrument that would weed out subjects whose stability scores are small not because they actually have a stable self-picture or are basically self-accepting, but because their defenses against the anxiety aroused by feelings of inadequacy, self-derogation, etc., are so rigid as to allow no ambivalence about themselves to appear on a conscious level. Brownfain (9) found a statistically significant negative correlation between F-Scale scores and the stability of self-concept index, but Cowen (14) found a nonsignificant but positive correlation between F-Scale scores and stability scores. Consequently, it was planned to use the F Scale as a selection device only if results similar to those obtained by Brownfain were obtained in this study.

Subjects

The subjects for this study were 146 female undergraduate university students. Their ages ranged from 17 to 23 years (mean age = 19.47). They constituted, then, a highly selected group with respect to sex, age, intellectual level, and, to a lesser extent, socioeconomic background.

Collection of the Data

The Self-Rating Inventory and the F Scale were administered to the 146 subjects. The Self-Rating Inventory was slightly modified to adapt the wording for a group of female subjects, and to allow them to supply their own frame of reference rather than to compare themselves to a specific group.

Since the product-moment r between F-Scale scores and stability scores was only $-.09$ and not significant, the F Scale was not considered useful for weeding out false positives in the self-accepting group, i.e., its use would have eliminated approximately the same number of cases with high, middle, and low scores.

Thirty subjects were selected from each tail of the distribution of stability of self-concept scores, providing a group with low stability scores (self-accepting group) and a group with high stability scores (nonself-accepting group). The 60 subjects thus chosen were given individual Rorschachs. Subjects were identified only by code number, and at no time was any other identifying information placed on the Rorschach records. All Rorschachs were administered and scored by the author, but he had no way of knowing at the time of administration and scoring in which group the case belonged. Scores were recorded on a separate scoring sheet so that nothing appeared on the Rorschach record at any time except the code number of the subject and the subject's responses and necessary accompanying notations.

The methods of scoring outlined by Klopfer and Kelley (25) were followed as closely as possible. Extra or modified scoring procedures were used where required by the predictions. The $\%R+$ was arrived at by scoring all responses either plus or minus and then dividing the plus total by total R. Beck's (4) frequency tables were used as the primary criterion for plus or minus with Hertz's tables (21) as an auxiliary criterion. In the few cases where a response could not be found in either set of tables, it was scored by comparison with other responses or by subjective judgment. The scoring of popular responses included all of Klopfer and Kelley's and all of Beck's populars. In scoring exaggerated size and power, such descriptive words as *large*

or *small* were not considered to show exaggeration un'ess modified by such words as *very, quite, extremely,* etc. However, adjectives such as *huge* or *tiny* were considered to express exaggeration for this purpose.

In computing the total of each type of score, every primary score was given unit value, while additional scores were given one half that value.

Since the kinds of material involved in predictions 26, 27, 28, and 29 are not included in the formal scoring categories of such Rorschach authorities as Klopfer and Kelley (25) and Beck (4, 5, 6), the Rorschach records were rescored approximately six weeks after the first scoring to provide a measure of the reliability with which this type of material can be scored. The percentage of agreement between the first and second scorings was used as the measure of reliability.

In order to provide an over-all evaluation of the efficiency with which the Rorschach can discriminate between self-accepting and nonself-accepting people—an evaluation independent of the predictions for specific Rorschach factors put forth in this study—each of six judges experienced in Rorschach interpretation were asked to rate 10 Rorschach records on a 7-point scale as to degree of self-acceptance. The judges were provided with the Rorschach protocols, a psychogram, and a summary of scores and significant relationships. They were also provided with excerpts from the literature from which the correlates of self-acceptance used in this study were derived.

Each of four additional judges rated 10 of the same Rorschach records rated by the first six judges so that a measure of interjudge agreement based on 10 judges might be obtained.

Statistical Analysis of Predictions[2]

Since the two groups were homogeneous with respect to number of responses, it was not deemed necessary to control for this factor, and the *t* ratio was used as the principal method of analyzing differences in Rorschach performance between the two groups. However, an inspection of the statistics computed to obtain the *t* ratios revealed that a number of the distributions of Rorschach scores were skewed. An additional analysis of the data was, therefore, made by using the median of the combined distributions for each Rorschach variable as a cutting score and comparing by chi square the number of cases from each group falling above and below this cutting point. Since the direction of the difference between groups was predicted in advance in each case, only one tail of the *t* distribution was used to establish significance, except in the few cases where results were in the opposite direction to that predicted. Predictions 11 and 23 were analyzed for trends by Hammond's (20) tabulation method for analyzing combinations of Rorschach scores. The degree to which the judges' ratings differentiated the two groups was examined by using the *t* ratio to test the difference between mean ratings. The number of cases from each group with a rating of four or higher and the number from each group with a rating of three or lower were compared by a chi-square test. A product-moment

[2] A number of tables and figures giving detailed summaries of data obtained in this study have been deposited with the American Documentation Institute. See Appendix for a list of these tables and figures. Order Document No. 4245 from ADI Auxiliary Publications Project, Photoduplication Service, Library of Congress, Washington 25, D.C., remitting in advance $1.75 for 35 mm. microfilm or $2.50 for photocopies. Make checks payable to Chief, Photoduplication Service, Library of Congress.

coefficient of correlation was computed between ratings of judges who rated the same Rorschach records. A *t* test and chi-square analysis were also performed to show how reliably the second set of ratings differentiated the two groups.

Analysis Using Negative Rating as the Selection Criterion

When the subjects tested with the Rorschach were rearranged according to negative self-ratings on the Brownfain (9) Self-Rating Inventory, the 20 subjects with the highest negative ratings were chosen as the self-accepting group, and the 20 subjects with the lowest negative ratings were selected as the nonself-accepting group. The same statistical procedures used in the primary analysis were followed.

IV. Results

Analysis Using Stability of Self-concept as Selection Criterion

The *t* ratio and chi-square values for the differences between groups in the specific Rorschach factors studied here are presented in Table 1. In 22 of the 28 tests, the differences are in the predicted direction in the *t* tests, while in the chi-square tests 18 differences are in the predicted direction, with four variables showing no difference. Although the differences between groups are predominantly in the predicted direction, only seven differences are significant or nearly significant, and three of these differences are for variables that overlap with two

TABLE 1

Chi Squares and *t* Tests of Rorschach Variables for the Self-Accepting and Nonself-Accepting Groups Selected by Stability of Self-Concept Scores

Variable	*t*	*p*	Chi Square	*p*
Anxiety score	.28	.80	1.07	.30
[*FCh*−(*ChF*+*Ch*)]wt.	.43	.33*	1.07	.30*
k+*K*	.87	.19*	.26	.63*
c	.27	.39*	.00	1.00
m	1.97	.03*	1.07	.30*
Exaggerated size	1.48	.08*	.27	.63*
H−*Hd*	.01	.50*	1.07	.30*
Hdx+*Adx*	2.00	.06	4.80	.03
Hostility score	.93	.18*	.00	1.00
M	.95	.17*	1.67	.20*
F%	.03	.49*	.00	1.00
P discrepancy	.85	.20*	4.27	.04*
%*R*+	4.71	.001*	15.00	.001*
%*Dr*	.50	.31*	.00	1.00
FC−(*CF*+*C*)	1.85	.03*	3.27	.07*
[*FC*−(*CF*+*C*)]wt.	1.54	.06*	1.07	.30*
M+*FC*−(*CF*+*C*)	1.32	.09*	4.27	.04*
FC	1.74	.05*	2.40	.13*
Sum C	.15	.88	.60	.45*
Fc	.79	.21*	2.40	.13*
(*Fc*+*c*+*C*′)−(*FC*+*CF*+*C*)	.60	.55	3.27	.07
W+	2.00	.06	1.07	.30
H+*Hd*	.96	.17*	1.07	.30*
Defense mechanisms (Pred. 26)	.24	.41*	.00	1.00
Indecisiveness (Pred. 27)	.93	.18*	.32	.59*
Indecisiveness (Pred. 28)	.43	.33*	.07	.80*
Defensiveness	.41	.34*	.07	.80*
(*H*+*A*)−(*Hd*+*Ad*)	.57	.58	1.07	.30

* Difference is in the predicted direction.

TABLE 2

CHI SQUARES AND *t* TESTS OF RORSCHACH VARIABLES FOR THE SELF-ACCEPTING AND NONSELF-ACCEPTING GROUPS SELECTED BY NEGATIVE SELF-RATING SCORES

Variable	*t*	*p*	Chi Square	*p*
Anxiety score	.17	.87	.40	.54
[*FCh*−(*ChF*+*Ch*)]wt.	1.72	.05*	1.60	.20*
k+*K*	1.81	.04*	.96	.34*
c	.18	.43*	.12	.90*
m	1.72	.05*	1.60	.20*
Exaggerated size	.86	.19*	.00	1.00
H−*Hd*	1.36	.09*	1.60	.20*
Hdx+*Adx*	1.78	.09	3.13	.08
Hostility score	.90	.18*	.00	1.00
M	1.74	.04*	3.60	.06*
F%	1.33	.09*	1.60	.20*
P discrepancy	1.12	.13*	3.60	.06*
%*R*+	3.46	.003*	10.00	.003*
%*Dr*	1.72	.05*	.40	.54*
FC−(*CF*+*C*)	2.57	.005*	6.40	.01*
[*FC*−(*CF*+*C*)]wt.	1.56	.06*	1.60	.20*
M+*FC*−(*CF*+*C*)	2.70	.004*	6.40	.01*
FC	2.25	.02*	4.90	.03*
Sum C	.06	.95	1.60	.20*
Fc	1.39	.08*	2.50	.12*
(*Fc*+*c*+*C'*)−(*FC*+*CF*+*C*)	.55	.58	.40	.54
W+	1.06	.29	.90	.35
H+*Hd*	1.10	.14*	.90	.35*
Defense mechanisms (Pred. 26)	.21	.83	.10	.76
Indecisiveness (Pred. 27)	.88	.19*	.48	.50*
Indecisiveness (Pred. 28)	.32	.75	.40	.54
Defensiveness	1.70	.04*	3.60	.06*
(*H*+*A*)−(*Hd*+*Ad*)	.09	.93	.90	.35

* Difference is in the predicted direction.

others and, therefore, cannot be considered as separate tests. Six of the differences are in the direction opposite to that predicted, and one of these is significant or nearly significant.

A *t* ratio of 2.05 was obtained in testing for the significance of the difference between the means of the judges' ratings of the Rorschach records. This *t* is significant at the .02 level. The chi-square analysis of the number of cases in each group with a rating of four or higher and the number with a rating of three or lower gives a chi square of 3.36 with a probability value of .07. The product-moment correlation coefficients between the ratings of judges who rated the same Rorschachs were .57, .55, .39, and .56, with probability values of .08, .10, .26, and .09 respectively.

The tabulation analysis of Predictions 11 and 23 did not reveal any trend toward a pattern relationship.

Analysis Using Negative Self-rating as Selection Criterion

The *t* ratio and chi-square values for the differences between groups in the specific Rorschach factors studied here are presented in Table 2. Results of this analysis are considerably more clear-cut than those of the preceding analysis. Nineteen of the *t* tests have probability values of less than .20 and 14 of these have probability values of less than .10.

The test for the significance of the difference between means of the judges' ratings of the Rorschachs gave a *t* of 2.07, which is significant at the .02 level.

Reliability of Scoring of Rorschach Factors Used in Predictions 26, 27, 28, and 29.

The percentage of agreement between the two separate scorings of these factors was: (*a*) Prediction 26 = 92%, (*b*) Prediction 27 = 87%, (*c*) Prediction 28 = 86%, and (*d*) Prediction 29 = 77%.

V. Discussion and Conclusions

Limitations of the Study

Eleven correlates of self-acceptance were derived from the literature on this subject, but no test was made in this study of whether or not the psychological variables of these correlates actually exist in different degrees in the two groups of subjects used. The information on which the correlates were based was primarily obtained from the study of clinic populations and/or persons undergoing some form of psychotherapy. These studies give only inferential information about a "normal," or nonclinic population, such as the one used here.

The validation of the psychological meaning of various kinds of Rorschach behavior has also been based primarily on clinic or hospital populations, and there is not much information available about whether the scores or "signs," which seem to indicate the presence of anxiety, for example, will show up in the same way or with enough frequency in a nonclinic population to provide meaningful tests for the presence of this psychological variable in a "normal" group. In other words, we do not know with any high degree of confidence that the Rorschach is a sensitive enough instrument to differentiate between "normals" with respect to specific personality characteristics.

The problem of measuring a personality characteristic such as self-acceptance also imposes a limitation on conclusions to be drawn from this study. Expressed attitudes, which are known to be subject to conscious and probably also to unconscious distortion, were used as a basis for selecting the groups. It was suspected that some of the subjects who expressed attitudes of self-acceptance are basically nonself-accepting, but no suitable procedure for weeding out such false positives was found. Since the Rorschach is believed to measure attitudes on a deeper level than those expressed consciously, the presence of false positives in the self-accepting group ought to make it more difficult to find differences between the groups.

Finally, the subjects used in this study were highly selected with respect to sex, age, intelligence and, to a lesser degree, socioeconomic background. Any application, therefore, of the results of this study to a differently constituted group should be made with caution.

The General Hypothesis

The large number of differences between groups, which were in the predicted direction, seems to indicate that a relationship between performance on the Rorschach test and stability of self-concept scores on the Self-Rating Inventory has been demonstrated. This distribution of differences takes essentially the same pattern whether the results are considered from the viewpoint of the difference between group means or from looking at the frequency with which cases fall above or below the median score on each variable. However, the lack of statistical significance of many individual differences between groups

makes it impossible to state positively that the general hypothesis has been confirmed on the basis of the primary analysis of results.

On the other hand, the judges' ratings of the Rorschach records show at least a strong tendency toward an ability to differentiate the groups on the basis of Rorschach performance. This statement is qualified as a "strong tendency" because of the general lack of reliability of the ratings. A statistically significant coefficient of correlation, however, would be extremely difficult to obtain in any case, because of the small number of cases (10) rated by each judge.

The results of the secondary analysis, i.e., the analysis of the data obtained by regrouping the subjects on the basis of negative self-rating, are much less equivocal. This analysis seems to indicate a fairly strong relationship between performance on the group of Rorschach factors studied here and negative self-rating on the Self-Rating Inventory. One reservation must be made, however. Although there was evidence to support the belief that the negative self-rating would be a discriminating selection criterion, the groups were not selected originally on the basis of this score and would have been constituted somewhat differently had this been done.

The Specific Predictions

Four of the Rorschach variables studied here—$k + K$, c, exaggerated size and power, blocked and indecisive M's and FM's—were used so infrequently that they do not appear to be useful variables for studying a population such as the one used in this study. Eight others—anxiety score, hostility score, *Sum C*, $(Fc + c + C') - (FC + CF + C)$, $W+$, the variables of Predictions 26 and 28, and $(H + A) - (Hd + Ad)$—were clearly not differentiating and would seem to have little or no relationship to self-acceptance as measured in this study. The writer could form no hypothesis from the data concerning the reason why the difference between the groups in $Hdx + Adx$ was so strongly in the direction opposite to that predicted.

Reliability of Scoring Rorschach Factors Used in Predictions 26, 27, 28, and 29

The obtained percentages are considered to indicate that materials of these types can be reliably scored. A possible exception would be the defensive verbalizations of Prediction 29. Reliability of scoring these verbalizations might be improved by a more careful definition of the classes of verbalizations and more precise criteria for scoring them.

Conclusions and Implications

Although Section II contains a great deal of material about psychological and emotional variables, which were called correlates of self-acceptance, these correlates were used only as a convenient medium through which predictions could be made about Rorschach behavior. Conclusions about the actual presence of these psychological and emotional variables in the subjects used in the study can be based only inferentially on the degree to which the predictions were verified. It is preferable to speak in terms of whether or not performance on the Rorschach factors studied here was related to scores derived from an instrument which purports to measure self-acceptance. Experimental validation of the correlates of self-acceptance ought to be an important part of the continuing research on attitudes toward the self.

A clearly defined relationship between performance on the Rorschach factors studied and the primary selection crite-

rion was not demonstrated by the methods employed. The differences between too many of the individual Rorschach factors, although they were predominantly in the predicted direction, could have been chance differences. The ratings of the judges tended to support the hypothesis of a relationship between performance on the Rorschach and a measure of self-acceptance, and the evidence from the secondary analysis suggests that a clear and sharp relationship can be demonstrated. The conclusion, based on the evidence from the judges' ratings and the secondary analysis of differences between the groups, is presented that the general hypothesis of a relationship between behavior on the Rorschach and a measure of self-acceptance has been tentatively confirmed.

A further conclusion seems to be justified. The findings of this study indicate that a number of individual Rorschach scores and combinations of scores are sensitive enough to differentiate between groups selected from a normal population on the basis of differences in a criterion type of behavior. It should be emphasized that only those Rorschach factors that appeared to be likely to differentiate between the groups used in this study were examined. The writer proposes a study of these and other Rorschach factors in relation to their ability to differentiate between groups selected on the basis of other criterion behaviors.

VI. Summary

A considerable amount of theoretical writing and research in the past decade has been devoted to the self concept and aspects of the self concept such as self-acceptance. The study reported here developed out of an interest in this theoretical and experimental work and in the attempts to measure components of the self concept. The specific interest in the study centered around self-acceptance and the Rorschach test. If self-acceptance is an important personality variable and closely related to psychological adjustment, as a considerable amount of theoretical thinking and research suggests, and if the Rorschach is capable of evaluating personality structure and adjustment, it should be possible to demonstrate a relationship between Rorschach performance and scores on a measure of self-acceptance.

Eleven correlates of self-acceptance were derived from the theoretical writing and experimental work dealing with attitudes toward the self. Through the medium of these correlates and Rorschach theory and research, 30 predictions were made about the ways in which the hypothesized relationship would be manifested in Rorschach performance.

The Brownfain Self-Rating Inventory and the F Scale developed by Frenkel-Brunswik and her associates were administered to 146 female undergraduate university students between the ages of 18 and 23. The F Scale did not prove to be a useful instrument for weeding out subjects who appeared to have a stable self concept through rigid defenses against a low level of self-esteem or ambivalence arising from a lack of self-acceptance. A group of 30 subjects who, according to the criterion of self-acceptance used, showed a high level of self-acceptance and a group of 30 subjects who showed a low level of self-acceptance were chosen from the total population. These 60 subjects were given individual Rorschachs. Subjects with high "stability

of self-concept" scores and subjects with low "stability of self-concept" scores were compared with respect to selected Rorschach variables (the primary analysis).

After this, the 20 subjects (from the 60 given Rorschachs) who had the highest negative self-ratings on the Brownfain Self-Rating Inventory were chosen as a self-accepting group and the 20 subjects having the lowest negative self-ratings were chosen as a nonself-accepting group. Another analysis of the data was then made (the secondary analysis).

The 60 Rorschach records were rated as to level of self-acceptance on a seven-point scale by judges experienced in Rorschach interpretation. It was hoped that this procedure would give an over-all estimate of the hypothesized relationship independent of the specific Rorschach predictions of this study.

Both the *t* ratio and chi square were used to test the differences between the experimental groups. The differences between groups were predominantly in the predicted direction, although few of these differences were significant in the primary analysis. The predicted relationships were much clearer and sharper in the secondary analysis.

Even though there was a general lack of reliability in the judges' ratings of the Rorschach records, there was a strong tendency for the judges to be able to differentiate the groups.

It was concluded that the hypothesized relationship has been tentatively confirmed. It was also concluded that a number of individual Rorschach factors are sensitive enough to differentiate between groups selected from a "normal" population on the basis of differences in a criterion behavior. The writer believes that much more research using the Rorschach with groups selected from a "normal" population is needed.

Appendix

TABLES AND FIGURES DEPOSITED WITH THE AMERICAN DOCUMENTATION INSTITUTE

Tables

1. Number of Rorschach Responses.
2. Range, Mean, and Standard Deviation of Rorschach Variables for the Self-Accepting Group Selected by Stability of Self-Concept Scores.
3. Range, Mean, and Standard Deviation of Rorschach Variables for the Nonself-Accepting Group Selected by Stability of Self-Concept Scores.
4. Difference between Group Means of Rorschach Variables and Tests of Significance for the Self-Accepting and Nonself-Accepting Groups Selected by Stability of Self-Concept Scores.
5. Frequency of Cases above the Median of the Total Group, Chi Squares and Probability Figures for Rorschach Variables for the Self-Accepting and Nonself-Accepting Groups Selected by Stability of Self-Concept Scores.
6. Range, Mean, and Standard Deviation of Judges' Ratings of Rorschach Records for the Groups Selected by Stability of Self-Concept Scores.
7. Significance of Differences between the Self-Accepting and Nonself-Accepting Groups Selected by Stability of Self-Concept Scores in Judges' Ratings of Rorschach Records.
8. Reliability of Judges' Ratings of Rorschach Records for the Self-Accepting and Nonself-Accepting Groups Selected by Stability of Self-Concept Scores.
9. Range, Mean, and Standard Deviation of Rorschach Variables for the Self-Accepting Group Selected by Negative Self-Rating.
10. Range, Mean, and Standard Deviation of Rorschach Variables for the Nonself-Accepting Group Selected by Negative Self-Rating.
11. Difference between Group Means of Rorschach Variables and Tests of Significance for the Self-Accepting and Nonself-Accepting Groups Selected by Negative Self-Rating.
12. Frequency of Cases above the Median of the Total Group, Chi Squares and Probability Figures for Rorschach Variables for the Self-Accepting and Nonself-Accepting Groups Selected by Negative Self-Rating.

13. Range, Mean, and Standard Deviation of Judges' Ratings of Rorschach Records for the Groups Selected by Negative Self-Rating.
14. Significance of Differences between the Self-Accepting and Nonself-Accepting Groups Selected by Negative Self-Rating in Judges' Ratings of Rorschach Records.
15. Percentage of Agreement between First and Second Scoring of the Rorschach Factors Used in Predictions 26, 27, 28, and 29.

FIGURES

1. Distribution of F-Scale Scores.
2. Distribution of Stability of Self-Concept Scores.
3. Distribution of Negative Self-Rating Scores.

REFERENCES

1. ADLER, A. *The practice and theory of individual psychology*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Trubner, 1925.
2. ADORNO, T. W., FRENKEL-BRUNSWIK, ELSE, LEVINSON, D. J., & SANFORD, R. N. *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper, 1950.
3. ALLPORT, G. W. The ego in contemporary psychology. *Psychol. Rev.*, 1943, **50**, 451-476.
4. BECK, S. J. *Rorschach's test*. II. *A variety of personality pictures*. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1945.
5. BECK, S. J. *Rorschach's test*. I. *Basic processes* (2nd Ed., Rev.) New York: Grune & Stratton, 1949.
6. BECK, S. J. *Rorschach's test*. III. *Advances in interpretation*. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1952.
7. BERGER, E. M. The relation between expressed acceptance of self and expressed acceptance of others. *J. abnorm. soc. Psychol.*, 1952, **47**, 778-782.
8. BILLS, R. E., VANCE, E. L., & MCLEAN, O. S. An index of adjustment and values. *J. consult. Psychol.*, 1951, **15**, 257-261.
9. BROWNFAIN, J. J. Stability of the self-concept as a dimension of personality. *J. abnorm. soc. Psychol.*, 1952, **47**, 597-606.
10. BUHLER, CHARLOTTE. Personality integration levels. *Rorschach Res. Exch.*, 1949, **13**, 9-24.
11. CALVIN, A. D., & HOLTZMAN, W. H. Adjustment and the discrepancy between self concept and inferred self. *J. consult. Psychol.*, 1953, **17**, 39-44.
12. CAMERON, N. *The psychology of behavior disorders: a biosocial interpretation*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1947.
13. COMBS, A. W. A phenomenological approach to adjustment theory. *J. abnorm. soc. Psychol.*, 1949, **44**, 29-35.
14. COWEN, E. L. An investigation of some relationships between two measures of self-regarding attitudes. Paper read at East. Psychol. Ass., Boston, April, 1953.
15. COWEN, E. L. The "negative self concept" as a personality measure. *J. consult. Psychol.*, 1954, **18**, 134-142.
16. ELIZUR, A. Content analysis of the Rorschach with regard to anxiety and hostility. *Rorschach Res. Exch.*, 1949, **13**, 247-284.
17. FROMM, E. Selfishness and self-love. *Psychiatry*, 1939, **2**, 507-523.
18. FROMM-REICHMANN, FRIEDA. Remarks on the philosophy of mental disorders. In P. Mullahy (Ed.), *A study of interpersonal relations*. New York: Hermitage Press, 1949.
19. GORLOW, L., ZIMET, C. N., & FINE, H. J. The validity of anxiety and hostility Rorschach content scores among adolescents. *J. consult. Psychol.*, 1952, **16**, 73-75.
20. HAMMOND, K. R. A tabulation method for analyzing combinations of Rorschach scores. *J. clin. Psychol.*, 1951, **7**, 276-279.
21. HERTZ, MARGUERITE R. *Frequency tables for scoring responses to the Rorschach inkblot test*. Cleveland, Ohio: Western Reserve Univer. Press, 1951.
22. HERTZMAN, M., & PEARCE, J. The personal meaning of the human figure in the Rorschach. *Psychiatry*, 1947, **10**, 413-422.
23. HILGARD, E. R. Human motives and the concept of the self. *Amer. Psychologist*, 1949, **4**, 374-382.
24. HORNEY, KAREN. *The neurotic personality of our time*. New York: Norton, 1937.
25. KLOPFER, B., & KELLEY, D. M. *The Rorschach technique*. Yonkers, New York: World Book, 1946.
26. LECKY, P. *Self-consistency: a theory of personality*. New York: Island Press, 1945.
27. LORD, EDITH. Two sets of Rorschach records obtained before and after brief psychotherapy. *J. consult. Psychol.*, 1950, **14**, 134-139.
28. MCINTYRE, C. J. Acceptance by others and its relation to acceptance of self and others. *J. abnorm. soc. Psychol.*, 1952, **47**, 624-625.
29. MUENCH, G. A. An evaluation of non-directive psychotherapy. *Appl. psychol. Monogr.*, 1947, No. 13.
30. MURPHY, G. *Personality: a bisocial approach to origins and structure*. New York: Harper, 1947.
31. PHILLIPS, E. L. Attitudes toward self and others: a brief questionnaire report. *J. consult. Psychol.*, 1951, **15**, 79-81.
32. PIOTROWSKI, Z. A. A Rorschach compendium. *Psychiat. Quart.*, 1947, **21**, 79-101.

33. RAIMY, V. C. The self-concept as a factor in counseling and personality theory. Unpublished doctor's dissertation, Ohio State Univer., 1943.
34. RAIMY, V. C. Self reference in counseling interviews. *J. consult. Psychol.*, 1948 **12**, 153-163.
35. RAPAPORT, D. *Diagnostic psychological testing.* Vol. II. Chicago: Year Book Publishers, 1949.
36. ROGERS, C. R. *Counseling and psychotherapy.* New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1942.
37. ROGERS, C. R. Some observations on the organization of personality. *Amer. Psychologist*, 1947, **2**, 358-368.
38. ROGERS, C. R. Perceptual reorganization in client-centered therapy. In R. R. Blake & G. V. Ramsey, *Perception: an approach to personality.* New York: Ronald, 1951.
39. ROGERS, C. R. *Client-centered therapy: its current practice, implications, and theory.* Boston: Houghton Miffiin, 1951.
40. SCHACHTYL, E. G. The dynamic perception and the symbolism of form. *Psychiatry*, 1941, **4**, 79-96.
41. SHEERER, ELIZABETH T. An analysis of the relationship between acceptance of and respect for self and acceptance of and respect for others in ten counseling cases. *J. consult. Psychol.*, 1949, **13**, 169-175.
42. SNYGG, D., & COMBS, A. W. *Individual behavior: a new frame of reference.* New York: Harper, 1949.
43. STOCK, DOROTHY. An investigation into the interrelations between the self concept and feelings directed toward other persons and groups. *J. consult. Psychol.*, 1949, **13**, 176-180.
44. SULLIVAN, H. S. *Conceptions of modern psychiatry.* Washington, D.C.: William Alanson White Psychiatric Foundation 1947.

(Acceptea for publication April 8, 1954)